ans 2/22

HAL VEEB
P.O. BOX 421815
S.F., CA. 94142-1815

FEB. 18, 1997

HAROLD WEISBERG
7627 OLD RECEIVER ROAD
FREDERICK, MD. 21702

Dear Hal:

I just received your latest letter & before that I had received 3 others. I did intend to write you sooner than this & I do appreciate your concern about me being possibly sick or having to endure bad weather conditions. No—I wasn't sick & my not replying wasn't due to bad weather. Actually it was due more to personal matters I just had to take care of.

One of these personal matters concerned my visits to various doctors recommended by my primary doctor who advised me. One was an eye specialist and it was determined that I now need to wear eyeglasses. This came as no great surprise to me as I knew I wasn't able to read smaller printed matter the way I could 10 or 20 years ago. It's all part of the natural aging process—inevitable. Otherwise my eyes are "perfect" according to the eye specialist. There are no cataracts or other eye abnormalities, fortunately.

So when I next see you, I'll be wearing glasses. I will be getting used to this as everyone else does and it should be no great inconvenience (except for remembering to pick up the glasses after you put them down other than in one's own home).

Another doctor I visited was a urologist since it was recommended I take a prostate biopsy which I did last week. As you know those over 55 are urged to get one & I'm going to be 66 in April of this year. I just talked to the doctor today (he received the results today) & he said the test results were negative so apparently there's no problem here. But as you know these ~~this~~ tests aren't totally conclusive but, at least, there is no sign of prostate cancer which the test could've indicated. Not that my primary doctor or urologist feared this but at least I can rest fairly sure of no prostate problem. Both my primary doctor & my urologist say I have an "enlarged" prostate but I understand this is as common as one catching a cold.

And this week I have to visit a gastroenterologist for another test so I don't know too much what this will result in. It may be because of my history of having gall stones removed but I'm uncertain of this. Perhaps various blood tests indicate something but I'll find out.

Otherwise my health is O.K. I still have been diagnosed as having an enlarged heart

& a heart "murmur" for which I'm taking pills of all sorts every day. Plus I have a quite high blood pressure (not good for heart patients as you know). My doctor advises more exercise & I try to ~~walk~~ walk several miles on weekends with a friend (who is 78). But I really am negligent about exercise & should ~~do~~ do more (I lay a heavy "guilt trip" on myself for not doing more).

Well, enough of my health but I thought I'd keep you informed. I do truly appreciate your concern, & I also hope you are O.K. & no problems occurring.

Because I'm writing this letter in immediate response to your latest I'm not enclosing any xeroxed item I wanted to send you. I would have to go to the xerox place & sometimes I have to wait in line. But I'll do it this week-end & send you what I intended to include in this letter.

Some of the items I'll be sending you will be: (1) an article in the January Penthouse on the ARRB by a writer John Wallach. I've never heard of him but the piece is pretty much of a "puff" piece. I don't know who Wallach is (do you?) but he seems unaware of the history of the case. At one point he makes the amazing absurdity that the ARRB was

formed to "restore the credibility of the CIA" (not a direct quote but close enough). At another point in the article Wallach several times refers to a Cubelo when he mean Cubela. Why this fellow Wallach wrote it I cannot say (other than being paid, of course). Gary Aguilar was aware of it because he sent me a copy of the article. ~~But~~ although he & one other JFK buff said it was a good objective account I don't see it as such & I'm sure you won't when you read it. I'll send it along next week.

(2) I'll enclose excerpts from the Fourth Decade & Walt Brown's journal "Deep Politics Quarterly". One excerpt will be a review of the LaFontaine's book. Somewhere either in that review or one of the excerpts the absolutely amazing absurdity is stated that what the LaFontaines "discovered" is the single most important piece of evidence to come down the track! Where are these "writers" — in some sort of fantasy land.

If this assertion isn't bad enough there is a fellow by the name of Armstrong who's developed a sensationalistic "theory" that there were two Oswalds & even two Marguerite Oswalds living at different addresses at the same time! One "reviewer" of Armstrong's

work calls his work also the most important evidence on the entire case. I know your thoughts on the "nuttiness" out there but you would be surprised (maybe not!) at how many people took all this in at various conferences! What happened to elementary logic & rational thinking we were supposedly taught not only in grammar & high school but to be utilized by the "higher academicians"! And it is this latter group most responsible for clinging to these absurdities! I kid you not (as if you didn't already know!).

(3) I'll also be sending you an article on James Earl Ray which appeared in the S.F. Chronicle I know you'll find of use. I understand King's son is pushing for a retrial but it is doubtful Washington will go along with that & Congress is too busy keeping up with the Clintons (pro or con).

Now as for as your query about the transcript I sent you containing the Groden testimony in the civil case against O.J. Simpson. As I've written previously the transcript was taken off the internet (or "Web"?) by a very reliable researcher, Art Snyder & given to me. It is undoubtedly reliable in the sense that whoever made it

must certainly had to get it either from a typed script or a recording. I'd doubt it was a recording because probably the only recording in that court room would be the official court stenographer. I'm simply uncertain as to the transcript's origin. Perhaps if you wrote to the address which, I believe, is at the beginning of the transcript you can find out. If you're writing on this & want absolute verification & don't want to say that it is an alleged transcript this is the best way to proceed = contact the source putting it out or call someone you know using the internet or Web. Since I don't have a computer I'm not in a position to tell you.

Also regarding how Groden got to be in the O.J. defense case, I'm at a loss here too. Possibly Oliver Stone (whose office is in Santa Monica) may have played a part in arranging this. Perhaps Dave Lifton may know. If you want I can contact a good friend in L.A., Dennis Effle, who always finds things like this out or I can call Dave himself & ask him. I won't, of course, tell either that you are behind me calling them. Let me know & I'll be glad to help you out on this score.

Thanks, finally, for the LBJ-Russell transcript of 9/18/64. Yes - I will use it for my book as it fits in with my main theme. And I'd forgotten that Epstein referred to this in his book (I mean the disagreement by Russell). I'll reread that Epstein part & see how I can include his mishandling of this aspect (as it undoubtedly was — whether deliberate or not!).

I'll close now & get this off in the mail tomorrow.

Best,
Hal Verb